

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 5, 6, 11, and 12 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. As such, claims 1-12 remain pending in the present application.

The drawings are objected to for various informalities. Figures 2, 3a, and 3b have been amended to include the legend "Prior Art" as suggested by the Examiner. Figures 2, 3a, 3b, and 4 have been amended to include a descriptive label as suggested by the Examiner. As such, Applicants request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

A substitute Abstract is attached hereto that is in accordance with the proper language and format noted by the Examiner. More specifically, the substitute Abstract consists of one paragraph and the last sentence has been deleted in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

The specification is objected to for various informalities. The specification has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 11 stand objected to for various informalities. Applicants have amended claims 5 and 11 to replace the phrase "said given and" with the phrase "said given signal processing path and" in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 5 and 11 be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 6 and 12 have been amended to replace the phrase "at least one of all other signal processing paths" with the phrase "a second given signal processing path." Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6 and 12 are clear and concise and request that the §112 rejection of claims 6 and 12 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art Figure 3b of the present application in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,455,844 to Ishikawa et al. ("Ishikawa"). Claims 1 and 7 recite, in part, the features of "dividing a signal processing path, in which said intermediate signal for a given symbol exceeds a given threshold" and adjusting "said given threshold in accordance with an estimate of noise in said intermediate signal." The purpose of the threshold of the presently claimed invention is to indicate when to

split up the signal among the multiple decision feedback equalizers (e.g., when the intermediate signal is above the threshold, two or more decision feedback equalizers are used for the antenna).

As noted in the Office Action, Figure 3b of the present application does not teach a feedback path of a decision feedback equalizer for adjusting a given threshold of an estimate of noise in an intermediate signal of a receiver. *See* Office Action, page 5. It is asserted that Ishikawa teaches this feature at Figures 1 and 2. Applicants submit that Ishikawa does not teach or suggest a threshold in any way. Further, it would not be possible to utilize a threshold to indicate when to split the signal among the multiple decision feedback equalizers in Ishikawa due to the fact that either the first branch or the second branch is selected by the branch selector. Therefore, In Ishikawa the signal is not split and sent to both equalizers as taught by claims 1 and 8 of the present application. *See* Ishikawa, col. 2, lines 13-27. Moreover, the estimation error recalculated value of Ishikawa controls the coefficient update circuit, whereas the threshold of the present invention indicates when to split up the signal among multiple decision feedback equalizers. *See* Ishikawa, col. 2, lines 28-42. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 7 distinguish over the combination of Figure 3b of the present application and Ishikawa and request that the §103 rejection of claims 1 and 7 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6 and 8-12 are either directly or indirectly dependent on one of claims 1 or 7 and should distinguish over Ishikawa for at least the same reasons as stated above. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 2-6 and 8-12 be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: 6/24/04

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ashley N. Moore

Registration No.: 51,667

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant